

Do inertial electric charges radiate with respect to uniformly accelerated observers?*

George E. A. Matsas

Instituto de Física Teórica, Universidade Estadual Paulista

Rua Pamplona 145, 01405-900, São Paulo, SP

Brazil

Abstract

We revisit the long standing problem of analyzing an inertial electric charge from the point of view of uniformly accelerated observers in the context of semi-classical gravity. We choose a suitable set of accelerated observers with respect to which there is no photon emission coming from the inertial charge. We discuss this result against previous claims [1].

04.60.+n

Typeset using REVTeX

*This Essay was awarded a *Honorable Mention* for 1994 by the *Gravity Research Foundation*

This essay is devoted to call attention to the increasing interplay between gravity and apparently unrelated areas. It is remarkable how mathematical techniques developed to shed light on quantum gravity physics ended by improving and changing our understanding about well established concepts. This is particularly true for semi-classical gravity where many subtleties about the elementary particle concept were realized. In order to illustrate it, we shall discuss in the context of semi-classical gravity the long standing problem whether inertial electric charges radiate or not with respect to uniformly accelerated observers [1].

In the early sixties it was realized that radiation is not a covariant concept. In 1963 Rohrlich found out that uniformly accelerated electric charges should not emit radiation with respect to co-accelerated observers [1]. This same conclusion was obtained lately by Boulware who also discussed the problem using a classical approach [2]. Recently, this issue was investigated quantum-mechanically in the framework of semi-classical gravity [3,4]. The result can be summarized in the statement: *Every Minkowski photon emitted by an accelerated charge as defined in the inertial frame corresponds to the emission or absorption of a zero-energy Rindler photon as defined in the accelerated frame.* This is in agreement with the classical result because zero-energy Rindler photons are not detectable by observers with finite acceleration [4]. The *Minkowski* and *Rindler* labels will be used to distinguish between quantities defined with respect to inertial and accelerated frames respectively. This is necessary because one of the main outputs obtained from semi-classical gravity is that the particle content of a quantum field theory can be distinct in diverse frames.

A related but different question is: *Do inertial electric charges radiate with respect to uniformly accelerated observers?* Rohrlich addressed this question in the context of classical electrodynamics [1]. Basically, he first calculated the electromagnetic stress-energy tensor $T_M^{\mu\nu}$ due to a static charge in the usual Minkowski coordinates (t, z, x, y) , and next he transformed the result to Rindler coordinates (τ, ξ, x, y) , obtaining $T_R^{\mu\nu}$. Rindler coordinates are the natural coordinates to study uniformly accelerated observers, since they are static in this coordinate system. Rindler and Minkowski coordinates are related by

$$t = \frac{e^{a\xi}}{a} \sinh a\tau, \quad z = \frac{e^{a\xi}}{a} \cosh a\tau, \quad (1)$$

where a is some positive constant. Rohrlich states that the presence of non-vanishing T_R^{0i} components indicates that uniformly accelerated observers see radiation coming from inertial charges. Yet mathematically correct, the interpretation of this result is pretty anti-intuitive on energy grounds: *Where does the radiating energy come from?*

By now, it is well known that the relevant manifold to quantize any field with respect to uniformly accelerated observers is the Rindler wedge [5], *i.e.*, the portion of Minkowski space defined by $z > |t|$. The Rindler wedge can be covered by Rindler coordinates (1). The main difficulty in analyzing the radiation emitted by an inertial charge in terms of photons is the fact that, *in general*, the current associated with such a charge [$j(x^\mu) = e\delta(x)\delta(y)\delta(z)$] cannot be completely confined in any Rindler wedge. This is so because this current does not have a compact support in the t -time. As a result, it is not clear how to define the radiation associated with an inertial charge in terms of photons in an arbitrary uniformly accelerated frame. Here we shall show, however, that an adequate choice of accelerated observers can give a definite answer to this question. Namely, this set of accelerated observers would ascribe no particle emission coming from the inertial charge, and consequently no radiation.

A world line given by $\xi, x, y = \text{const}$ is characterized by having a constant proper acceleration $ae^{-a\xi}$. It was recently shown that an electric charge e following such a world line can only emit zero-energy Rindler photons in the accelerated frame. Yet possessing vanishing frequency, zero-energy Rindler photons carry transverse momentum $\mathbf{k}_\perp \equiv (k_x, k_y)$. The emission rate of such photons was calculated in a gauge invariant way [3,4]:

$$P_{k_\perp} d\mathbf{k}_\perp^2 = \frac{e^2}{4\pi^3 a e^{-a\xi}} |K_1(k_\perp e^{a\xi}/a)|^2 d\mathbf{k}_\perp^2, \quad (2)$$

where $K_\nu(z)$ is the Bessel function of imaginary argument. Now, let us take a sequence of world lines $W_n : [x = y = 0, \xi = \xi_n = \text{const} \ (n \in \mathbf{N})]$, such that $\xi_{n+1} > \xi_n$ and $\xi_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \rightarrow +\infty$. A charge following a world line W_n will have constant proper acceleration $\sqrt{a_\mu a^\mu} = ae^{-a\xi_n}$. In particular, a charge following the world line $W_{n \rightarrow +\infty} : [x = y = 0,$

$\xi = \text{const} \rightarrow +\infty]$ will be inertial, since $a_\mu a^\mu = 0$, and will be confined inside the Rindler wedge by construction. As a consequence, the corresponding accelerated observers associated with the Rindler wedge will be able to answer properly if they expect to detect or not any photon emission from this inertial charge. It is this inertial charge which will be chosen to be analyzed in the uniformly accelerated frame. Taking the limit $\xi \rightarrow +\infty$ in (2), we conclude that such an inertial charge emits *no* photons at all with respect to our accelerated observers. Our result is not in contradiction with Rohrlich's conclusion because both approaches are inequivalent. Note that in the procedure above we decided to move the charge with respect to the Rindler wedge. This is completely equivalent of keeping the charge still, and moving the accelerated observers to the opposite direction.

The fact that these accelerated observers detect no radiation is compatible with a number of other facts. Firstly, the emission or absorption of a Rindler photon as defined in the accelerated frame is unavoidably associated with the emission of a Minkowski photon as defined in the inertial frame *provided the source is contained in the Rindler wedge* [6,7]. Since inertial charges do not emit Minkowski photons with respect to inertial observers, they cannot emit Rindler photons with respect to our accelerated observers either. Notice that this reasoning depends crucially of the fact that the whole current is confined inside the wedge. Secondly, it was natural to expect on energy grounds that inertial charges do not emit photons with respect to these observers because there is in this case no way to provide energy for the radiation.

Although our conclusion that an inertial charge following $W_{n \rightarrow +\infty}$ should not radiate with respect to our uniformly accelerated observers could be qualitatively anticipated from the first argument given above, we believe that this discussion contributes to clarify this question, and dissipates any misconceptions about it. Inequivalent definitions of radiation are allowable, provided they do not disagree concerning any real events. This is clearly illustrated by the Unruh effect [8], which predicts that the excitation of a detector uniformly accelerated in Minkowski vacuum is associated with the emission of a Minkowski particle, and absorption of a Rindler particle according to inertial and co-accelerated observers re-

spectively. Notwithstanding, both set of observers agree about the excitation rate of the detector. It should be so because the excitation phenomenon is an event, in opposition to the particle content of a field theory which depends on the reference frame. In the case studied above, every approaches must agree with the fact that an inertial electric charge must stay at rest with respect to, say, a companion uncharged particle. In our analysis in the accelerated frame, this conclusion is straightforward since, according to us, the inertial electric charge emits no Rindler photons, and thus, no recoiling can be observed.

It is widely believed that semi-classical gravity can predict quantum gravity effects before a full theory is available. It may be that the Hawking radiation emitted by black holes turns out to be the first observed quantum gravity effect. Yet only future data will be able to decide on it, it is fair to say that semi-classical gravity has broadened considerably our knowledge about many physical concepts, and is valuable in its own right.

Acknowledgements

I am deeply indebted to Atsushi Higuchi and Daniel Sudarsky for enlightening conversations about various topics related with this issue, and to the inspiring environment provided by the Enrico Fermi Institute at the University of Chicago where these discussions began. I am also thankful to Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico, a Brazilian agency, for financial support during the period this work was produced.

REFERENCES

- [1] F. Rohrlich, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **22**, 169 (1963).
- [2] D.G. Boulware, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **124**, 169 (1980).
- [3] A. Higuchi, G.E.A. Matsas and D. Sudarsky, Phys. Rev. D **45**, R3308 (1992).
- [4] A. Higuchi, G.E.A. Matsas and D. Sudarsky, Phys. Rev. D **46**, 3450 (1992).
- [5] S.A. Fulling, Phys. Rev. D **7** 2850 (1973). 609 (1975).
- [6] W.G. Unruh and R.M. Wald, Phys. Rev. D **29** 1047 (1984).
- [7] B.S. Kay, and R.M. Wald, Phys. Rep. **207** 49 (1991).
- [8] W.G. Unruh, Phys. Rev. D **14**, 870 (1976).